



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (01-09)

Approved for use through 02/28/2009. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

## PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

042564

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Typed or printed name \_\_\_\_\_

Application Number

10/501,092

Filed

January 25, 2005

First Named Inventor

Katsuya ITOH

Art Unit

1796

Examiner

Alicia Toscano

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 56,868

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Andrew G. Melick

Typed or printed name

(202) 822-1100

Telephone number

March 30, 2009

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☐ \*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of: **Katsuya ITOH**

Art Unit: **1796**

Application Number: **10/501,092**

Examiner: **Alicia Toscano**

Filed: **January 25, 2005**

Confirmation Number: **3054**

For: **POLYESTER FILMS**

Attorney Docket Number: **042564**

Customer Number: **38834**

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

**Mail Stop: AF**

Date: March 30, 2009

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Request is filed concurrent with a Notice of Appeal in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §41.31. Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending in the present application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by **Majima** (WO 01/092417 as evidenced by U.S. 6,780,482, which is used as an Equivalent English document).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

(1) Applicant respectfully submits that it was a clear error for the Office Action to not consider the dependency of the compression ratio on the half value width which demonstrates

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review  
Attorney Docket No.: 042564  
Application No.: 10/501,092

that the recited half value width is not inherent in Majima.

The Office Action compares Example 1 and Comparative Example 1 of the specification and concludes that for a PET/silica and PBT/phosphorous 40/60 mixture processed at a compression ratio of 1.5, a temperature less than 285°C is required for satisfying the half value width as recited in the claims. The Office Action takes the position that Majima satisfies the composition and temperature requirement, and concludes that “as the processing conditions are met, Examiner finds the half value width of the recrystallization peak to be inherent in Majima.” (Office Action, page 4.)

However, as demonstrated in the specification, the compression ratio is also a processing condition that must be satisfied to obtain the recited half value width. As stated in the Amendment of September 19, 2008, a comparison of Example 1 and Example 3 demonstrates the effect of the compression ratio. (See Amendment, September 19, 2008, page 8.) The Examples had the same processing conditions except for compression ratio of extruder III. (Specification, page 24, lines 20-25.) Thus, a comparison of Example 1 and Example 3 demonstrates the effect of the compression ratio on the resulting half value width. The half value width for Example 1 satisfied claim 1, but the half value width of Example 3 did not satisfy claim 1. Thus, evidence in the record establishes that the half value width depends on compression ratio (among other factors such as composition and temperature).

The Office Action acknowledges that Majima is silent about compression ratio, (Office Action, page 2), and the specification demonstrates that compression ratio is a critical factor for obtaining the recited half value width. Furthermore, Applicant submitted data in a declaration on

December 19, 2007 demonstrating an Example from Majima that does not satisfy the recited half value width. Thus, it was clearly erroneous for the Office Action to assume that Majima necessarily satisfies the recited half value width based only on the disclosed composition and temperature in Majima.

(2) Applicant respectfully submits that it was a clear error for the Office Action to require a demonstration of non-inherency throughout the entire scope of the claims.

When relying on inherency, the Patent Office “must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described *in the reference*, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill.” MPEP § 2112(IV) citing *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasis added). A *prima facie* case based in part on inherency can be rebutted “by evidence showing that the *prior art products* do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product.” MPEP § 2112.01(I) citing *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Thus, Applicant can rebut a rejection based on inherency by demonstrating that the prior art reference does not necessarily possess the alleged inherent feature. There is no requirement to demonstrate non-inherency throughout the entire scope of the claim.

The Office Action compares Example 1 to Example 3 of the present specification and concludes that for the conditions in these examples, the compression ratio must be less than 4.0 for satisfying the half value width as recited in the claims. (Office Action, page 2.) The Office Action acknowledges that Majima is silent about compression ratio. But the Office Action takes the position that this result is not commensurate in scope with the claims and the Office Action requires data demonstrating non-inherency throughout the entire scope of the claim. (Office

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review  
Attorney Docket No.: 042564  
Application No.: 10/501,092

Action, page 2.)

To rebut the Office Action's allegation of inherency in Majima, Applicant has provided evidence demonstrating that films in Majima do not necessarily possess the recited half value width. A declaration was submitted on December 19, 2007 demonstrating that the half value width property is not inherent even if the compositional limitations are otherwise satisfied, and that when using a conventional extruder for processing a PET film, the composition in Majima itself does not possess the recited half value width.

Applicant has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the recited half value width is not inherent in Majima, and it was clearly erroneous for the Office Action to require a demonstration of non-inherency throughout the entire scope of the claims.

(3) Applicants respectfully submit that it was a clear error for the Office Action to require the claims to recite silica and phosphorous for the Examples of the specification to be commensurate in scope with the claims.

The Office Action states that the Examples in the specification are not commensurate in scope with the claims because the claims do not require silica and phosphorous. (Office Action, pages 2 and 3.)

However, the claims do not exclude silica or phosphorous. Furthermore, the cited Examples and Comparative Examples demonstrate that silica and phosphorous additives are not determinative components for satisfying the recited half value width. All of the Examples and Comparative Examples cited by the Examiner (Examples 1, 3 9 and Comparative Example 1) use silica and phosphorous additives. Moreover, Majima discloses the use of silica and phosphorous

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review  
Attorney Docket No.: 042564  
Application No.: 10/501,092

additives (col. 6, line 62 to col. 7, line 6; col. 9, lines 1-3; col. 11, lines 22-29; col. 16, lines 41-47), which further supports the similarity of the Examples in the present specification with those in Majima.

Thus, the cited Examples and Comparative Examples highlight the effects of temperature and compression ratio on the half value width, while keeping the effects of additives constant, and it is clearly erroneous for the Office Action to require the claims to recite silica and phosphorous for the Examples to be commensurate in scope with the claims.


For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Majima does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 3-9 either expressly or inherently, and it is requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Andrew G. Melick  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,868  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111